

### **REMARKS-ARGUMENTS**

Claims 16-34 are pending in the application identified above. The Examiner has rejected claims 16-34 in the Final Office Action dated February 1, 2007 ("Office Action"). By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 16, 22, 24, and 26 and added claim 35. Support for the amendments may be found, for example at paragraphs [068]-[069] and [084], and at Figure 5. Support for new claim 35 may be found, for example, at paragraph [084]. Applicants submit that claims 16-35 are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16 and 19-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,745,712 ("Turpin") in view of U.S. Patent 6,597,381 ("Eskridge"). The Examiner also rejected claims 17-18 as unpatentable over Turpin, in view of Eskridge, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,389,434 ("Rivette"). Applicants hereby traverse these rejections.

In the present application, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claims. For example, neither reference teaches a form layout view with layout items "wherein each of the layout items contains a summary of information to be entered into the layout item, and wherein the summary of information for each of the layout items in the preview contains wording different from wording used in the form sent to an output device" as recited in Applicants' amended claims 16, 24, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 16 and 19-34 are allowable over the cited prior art.

### **Claims 16 and 19-34**

Turpin discloses a system “for generating and using form data files that define: (a) a graphical image of a goal oriented form for display on a monitor; and (b) a graphical image of at least one decision tree.” See Turpin, col. 2:33-37. As part of the system, Turpin discloses a form tool which “operates much like a drawing package and displays forms as they are being defined.” Turpin, col. 17:46-48. To illustrate the form tool, Turpin, uses Figure 13, see Turpin, col. 17:65-18:10, but Turpin also uses Figure 13 to illustrate a user completing an output, see Turpin, col. 14:47-67. Accordingly, the wording disclosed in Turpin for the fields of the form tool corresponds exactly to the wording of the output form. Thus, Turpin fails to teach or suggest a form layout view with layout items “wherein each of the layout items contains a summary of information to be entered into the layout item, and wherein the summary of information for each of the layout items in the preview contains wording different from wording used in the form sent to an output device” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16, 24, and 26.

Eskridge fails to cure this deficiency. Eskridge discloses a system and method for an automated optical inspection system. See Eskridge, col. 1:6-9. As part of the system and method disclosed in Eskridge, a graphical user interface may show a graphical display area. See Eskridge, col. 6:33-35. As described in Eskridge, however, the graphical display area may show components on an automated optical inspection system. See Eskridge, col. 10:3-10; Fig. 1, element 20. Because Eskridge discloses a system for inspecting components on, for example, a printed wiring board, see Eskridge, col. 6:25-27, Eskridge does not result in an output form nor does it include a preview of a form to be sent to an output device. As a result, Eskridge fails to teach or

suggest a form layout view with layout items “wherein each of the layout items contains a summary of information to be entered into the layout item, and wherein the summary of information for each of the layout items in the preview contains wording different from wording used in the form sent to an output device” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16, 24, and 26. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 16, 24, and 26 are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow claims 16, 24, and 26.

Claims 19-23 and 31-32 depend from amended claim 16; claims 25 and 33 depend from amended claim 24; and claims 27-30 and 34 depend from amended claim 26. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons cited above for amended claims 16, 24, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow these claims.

### **Claims 17-18**

The Examiner rejected claims 17-18 as allegedly unpatentable over Turpin in view of Eskridge and in further view of Rivette. None of these cited references, however, teaches all elements of Applicants’ claims. For example, as discussed above, neither Turpin nor Eskridge at least teaches a form layout view with layout items “wherein each of the layout items contains a summary of information to be entered into the layout item, and wherein the summary of information for each of the layout items in the preview contains wording different from wording used in the form sent to an output device” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 16. Rivette fails to cure this deficiency.

Rivette discloses a system and method for annotating documents and other media. See Rivette, Abstract. According to Rivette, different views may be displayed in the disclosed system, including "a note centric view, an object centric view, a link centric view, and a user-defined view." See Rivette, col. 17:7-10. Of these views, the object view may be used to display the data object being annotated. See Rivette, col. 18:36-39. Nowhere, however, does Rivette disclose that the object view, or any of the other views, may be used to display a preview of the layout of a form to be sent to an output device. Accordingly, Rivette fails at least to teach or suggest a form layout view with layout items "wherein each of the layout items contains a summary of information to be entered into the layout item, and wherein the summary of information for each of the layout items in the preview contains wording different from wording used in the form sent to an output device" as recited in Applicants' amended claim 16. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 16 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 17-18 depend from amended claim 16. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons cited above for amended claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow these claims.

### Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 2, 2007

By:   
Jeffrey Danley  
Reg. No. 57,228